

### REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1 to 13 are pending in this case. Claim 2 has been objected for informality. Claims 3 - 6 and 10 - 13 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,084,951 to Smith et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,297 to Lee et al. Claims 2 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al., in view of Lee et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,958 to Houde. By this Response, applicant has amended claim 2. Reconsideration of the subject patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claim 2 was objected to for lack of antecedent basis for the term "the predetermined time." In response, applicant has amended claim to remove the informality. Accordingly, the subject objection is believed to be overcome.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 3 - 6 and 10 - 13 were objected to for informalities but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for kindly indicating the allowability of claims 3 - 6 and 10 - 13, but defers rewriting these claims until final resolution of the rejected claims.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 7 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Smith, in view of Lee. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 requires that "a timer for measuring a time period from a time instant of receiving the call." Although the Office Action states that Smith teaches timers, the Office Action does not show that the timers in Smith are

provided "for measuring a time period from a time instant of receiving the call" as recited in independent claim 1. At the portion of Smith cited in the Office Action, *i.e.*, column 5, line 60, Smith generally states that its feature processor has "timers" but Smith does not teach or even suggest that the timers are used "for measuring a time period from a time instant of receiving the call" as required in independent claim 1. Therefore, Smith does not disclose the above claim feature as required in claim 1.

Independent claim 1 also requires that "a memory for storing ... a predetermined time period ... which correspond[s] to a predetermined telephone number." The Office Action does not show that Smith teaches, and Smith is silent with respect to, a memory for storing a predetermined time period which corresponds to a predetermined telephone number as claimed. In the portion of Smith cited in the Office Action, Fig. 6, Smith merely teaches that the name and other contact and miscellaneous information are stored along with the telephone number(s). Therefore, Smith does not disclose the above claim feature as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action admits that Smith does not teach or suggest "the call is cut off within the predetermined time period" as claimed and cites Lee for its teachings of "disconnect a call according to a predetermined time period by using a timer." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lee merely teaches to disconnect a call after completion of a telephone conversation (see, *e.g.*, col. 2, lines 65 - 68). Lee does not teach cutting off the call within the predetermined time period as claimed. Therefore, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 is patentable over Smith and Lee.

Independent claim 8 recites: "storing ... a predetermined time period ... in a memory," "measuring a time period from receiving the call to being cut off the call," and "displaying the predetermined message on a display device of the wireless telephone device when the measured time period agrees with the predetermined time period." The Office Action does not show that Smith teaches and, Smith is

silent with respect to, the above features recited in independent claim 8. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in independent claim 8 is patentable over Smith and Lee.

In view of the above, claims 1, 7, and 8 are believed to be allowable. Accordingly, the subject rejection is believed to be overcome.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Smith as stated in claim 1 above, in view of Lee and Houde. In response, applicant submits that claims 2 and 9 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, and thus are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons claims 1 and 8 are allowable. Accordingly, the subject rejection is believed to be overcome.

Applicant has shown that all pending claims 1 to 13 are allowable over the cited art and hereby respectfully requests that the rejections and objection of the pending claims be withdrawn. Each of the presently pending claims 1 to 13 in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: August 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
Tel: (212) 835-1400